

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-42 stand rejected. Claims 1, 10, 15, 18, 21, 25, 30, 35, 36, and 39 have been amended. Claims 7-9 and 37 have been canceled.

### **Rejections under 35 USC 103**

Claims 1-11, 18, 21, 22, 25-27, 30-32, 35-37, and 39-41 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,415,294 issued to Niemi ("Niemi") in view of US Patent No. 6,510,406 issued to Marchisio ("Marchisio")

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method, in particular, in a client system, an automated method for assisting a user of the client system in retrieving and browsing information, the method comprising:

retrieving, by the client system, and displaying on a display of the client system for browsing, a first information page having first contents, responsive to user direction;

transmitting to a server, by the client system over a network connection, information about the first information page, wherein the server is not a source server of the first information page; and

automatically assembling and augmenting, by the client system, the first information page being browsed with one or more information source identifiers directly identifying one or more information pages with second contents that may be additionally retrieved, the one or more directly identified information pages being selected based at least in part on second keywords determined to be related to first keywords present in the first information page, and the second contents directly augmenting the first content, said one or more information source identifiers received from the server in response to the transmission.

Thus, claim 1 taken as a whole as required by law requires that the client system transmit information about the first information page to a server via a network connection and then augment a first information page using information source identifiers received from the server in response to the transmission. In the above-captioned Office Action, Examiner cites within the discussion of claim 10, Niemi column 6, lines 41-60, and column 7, lines 14-20, for the proposition that Niemi

anticipates such transmitting and receiving to and from a server.

Niemi discloses a method of developing a list of keywords present in documents viewed over time on a client system (see table 1 and column 8 lines 39-48 of Niemi). Niemi builds a database of documents viewed on a client system, creates a database of keywords contained in those documents, and then embeds search queries into newly-downloaded documents that allow a user to generate a list of all documents already viewed on the client system that contain the same keywords.

However, Niemi does not disclose all elements of claim 1. To be sure, Niemi discloses a “server” which is actually a module within the client system acting as a proxy server to the web browser (see Niemi column 4, line 6). However, this server does not exist as a separate physical server that the client transmits to “over a network connection” as required by claim 1. Additionally, assuming *arguendo* that the embedded search queries of Niemi are “information source identifiers” as used in claim 1, these queries are provided by text analysis function 13 of figure 2 (see also column 5, lines 8-17) which is also a module contained within the client system. Therefore, Niemi does not disclose that the “one or more information source identifiers [are] received from the server in response to the transmission” as required by claim 1. Thus, Niemi fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1.

Further, the cited text of Marchisio fails to remedy the deficiencies of Niemi. Marchisio discloses allowing a user to select any term in a downloaded page in order to generate related keywords and to eventually obtain a list of documents that associate the selected term with a selected one of the generated keywords. (See Marchisio column 16, lines 38-58 and figure 9.) However, the cited text does not disclose “transmitting to a server, by the client system over a network connection, information about the first information page, wherein the server is not a source server of the first information page” or that the “said one or more information source identifiers [are] received from the server in response to the transmission” as required by claim 1. Thus, Marchisio fails to remedy the deficiencies of Niemi.

Additionally, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

to modify Niemi to obtain the method of claim 1. The purpose of Niemi is to develop a database of documents retrieved by the user in the past and to use that list as a source of documents with information potentially related to a document currently being viewed. (See Niemi column 1, lines 56-63). Niemi stores this database on the client device. However, receiving the information source identifiers from a separate server, as required by claim 1, would of necessity require that the Niemi database be stored in the server, apart from the client device. Because the database of previously-viewed documents is meant to be client-specific, housing the database somewhere besides the client would add complexity without obtaining any benefit. By contrast, the method described in claim 1 recognizes that a broader database of documents – not only those documents previously retrieved by the client - could be used to augment the first information page and that it is potentially advantageous to store such a broad database in a centralized location where it is accessible by multiple clients. Therefore, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Niemi to obtain the method of claim 1.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable over Niemi either alone or in combination with Marchisio.

In regards to claims 2-6, 10, and 11, each depends from claim 1 incorporating its limitations. Thus, for at least the reasons cited above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 6, and 11 are also patentable over Niemi.

Claims 7-9 have been canceled rendering their rejections moot.

Independent claims 18, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 39 contain in substance the same limitations as claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons as claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 18, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 39 are also patentable over Niemi alone or in combination with Marchisio.

Claims 21, 26-27, 31-32, 36, and 40-41 depend from claims 20, 25, 30, 35, and 39 respectively, incorporating their limitations. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21, 26-27, 31-32, 36, and 40-41 are also patentable over Niemi and Marchisio.

Claim 37 has been rejected rendering its rejection moot.

Claims 12-17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, and 42 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi in view of Marchisio in further view of US Patent No. 6,271,840 issued to Finseth et al ("Finseth").

Claims 12-14, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38, and 42 depend from claims 1, 18, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 39 respectively incorporating their limitations. It is submitted above that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Niemi and Marchisio. Further Finseth fails to remedy the deficiencies of Niemi and Marchisio. Thus, for at least the reasons cited above in relation to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 12-14, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38, and 42 are patentable over the combination of Niemi, Marchisio, and Finseth.

Independent claim 15 contains in substance the same limitations as claim 1. Further, claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15 incorporating its limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons cited above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15-17 are patentable over the combination of Niemi, Marchisio, and Finseth.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-6, 10-36, and 38-42 are in condition for allowance. Entry of the foregoing is respectfully requested and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: May 4, 2007

/Richard B. Leggett/

Richard B. Leggett  
Reg. No. 59,485

U.S. Bank Centre  
1420 5<sup>th</sup>, Suite 3010  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Telephone: 206-292-0460